



PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Ave, Suite 1331, Portland OR 97204

Main: 503-823-5185 TTY: 503-823-6868 Fax: 503-823-7576 Portland.gov/Transportation

Jo Ann Hardesty Commissioner **Chris Warner** Director

Northwest Parking District	Zoom Meeting
Stakeholder Advisory	January 19, 2022
Committee (SAC)	4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

To watch meeting recording go to:

https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/NZdMWZL3kS98_jCuGTR6UB66BjpZ-87wGH63Rkjs_o0peTEBQtU31zmmMvgYUXL.LMICIAUigTDECo5w Passcode: dYx2R+##*

Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Rick Michaelson (Chair, At-large)
Nick Fenster (Vice Chair, Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
Daniel Anderson (At-Large)
Mark Stromme (At-Large)
Karen Karlsson (Northwest District Association, NWDA)
Amy Spreadborough (Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
Don Singer (Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
Thomas Ranieri (Northwest Business Association, NWBA)
Peter Rose (At-Large)
Ron Walters (Northwest District Association, NWDA)
Alex Zimmerman (At-Large)
Jeanne Harrison (Northwest District Association, NWDA)

Members Absent

Parker McNulty (Northwest District Association, NWDA)

Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) Staff

Rae-Leigh Stark (Northwest Parking District Liaison)
Stanley Ong (Parking Program Specialist)
Rani Boyle (Right of Way Management & Permitting Manager)
Nick Falbo (Senior Transportation Planner)
Chris Armes (Group Manager)

Kristan Alldrin (Program Manager)

Consultant Staff

Owen Ronchelli (RWC)

Public in Attendance

Allen Classan
Lewellyn Robison
Steve Pinger
Lisa Strader
Joel Nunez

2021 Parking Assessment and Permit Analysis

Owen presented the 2021 Parking Assessment and Permit Analysis. There has been a small increase in Zone M permits issued. There was an increase in number of vehicles, but a reduction in number of permits due to the number of temporary permits that were issued.

Owen made the following recommendations:

- The recommended allocation of permits is 4650. This leaves some room for potential growth in the district.
- Change enforcement hours from 9-7 to 10-8
- Stall reformatting – eliminate 5 1-hour stalls, and 16 no-limit stalls

Owen said the following about Healthy Business permits:

- Need to balance impact on system. Currently still at 85% occupancy, but that may change as the pandemic gets better.
- The stalls typically chosen tend to be high turnover stalls in commercial areas
 - Short term parking needs are being pushed further into residential portions
- 76 on-street spaces impacted (less than 2%) mostly on 21st and 23rd
 - Only 256 total stalls are short term stalls in area. 30% of short-term stalls no longer available
- There likely is an impact on net meter revenue collected from short-term stalls

Karen asked if committee could have 2019 permit numbers as well since 2020 was a pandemic year, and she does not think looking at 2020 and 2021 will accurately reflect use. Owen responded that he made references to 2019 when he thought the 2020 and 2021 numbers should not be used.

Karen thinks the percentage (44%) of low income permits seems high. She has concerns that people are abusing the low-income permit.

Ron stated that the 2 pandemic years (2020 and 2021) are completely different than 2019 and prior. Ron asks if Northwest sees a return to pre-pandemic numbers this year, will Northwest be ready for the volume of visitors and cars.

Rick noticed that early morning and late evening, the residential permits do not appear to be used. Rick asks where these residents are parking at night, or if this might mean that there is abuse. Owen responded that they only look at a portion of the stalls, and that information is not collected until 8:00 am.

Rick said if they implement a cap on the number of permits issued, the committee may need to further discuss an incentive needed for individuals to cancel their permits when they leave Northwest.

Rick commented that if there are any outlier space designations left. Rick also thinks there is opportunity in repurposing spaces to things such as truck loading zones.

Mark suggests that he does not see parking enforcement occurring, and asked to clarify the levels of enforcement. Rae-Leigh will confirm that enforcement happens, but will need to confirm with enforcement regarding hours. Rick also is interested in level of coverage – number of stalls covered and frequency. Karen also requested number of violations issued.

Rick commented that placement of Healthy Business spaces needs to be carefully looked at. Healthy Business spaces may have negative impact on neighboring businesses.

Rick commented that the turnover rate does not appear to be different between 2-hour and 4-hour stalls. Maybe the committee should discuss if there is the correct balance between short-term and long-term spaces.

Nick Fenster asked if the 30% impacted area is district-wide, or just in the survey sample area. Owen clarified that the 30% is based off the sample area near 21st and 23rd streets. Karen noted that sample area is largely centered on 21st and 23rd and likely captures most of the Healthy Business spaces.

Healthy Business Program Update

Rani Boyle and Nick Falbo gave an update on the Healthy Business Program (HBP).

- Program was different before the pandemic. There were only 10 installations between 2014 and 2019, only one in Northwest. The permit was quite expensive, and included a base permit fee and lost parking revenue fee. The process also required design review.
- HBP was an emergency response built on the existing Community Use permit. The focus has been on access and removing barriers for businesses. The permit fee was

waived, and there has been limited design review with a focus on temporary materials.

- About 400 permits have been issued, with the current permits expiring in June.
- Concerns typically come from design issues with permit compliance, accessibility issues due to things like blocked sidewalks, traffic safety concerns, and impacts on on-street parking availability.
 - “If something has not seemed like an imminent safety concern, we have had a very light touch”
 - “As time moves on, we’re going to move into a stronger compliance and enforcement stance”
- The installations are regulated by many partners. PBOT focuses on use of right of way and pedestrian safety. Other partners are responsible for things such as noise (civic life), and emergency vehicle access (fire and rescue).
- It is likely that the next permit cycle will have a fee. As the program gets further developed, even small fees businesses might impact the number of businesses participating. If fewer business renew, that might result in fewer concerns and impacts.

Rick asked if example structure shown on the “Concerns” slide is likely to be approved. Rani stated it is extremely unlikely to approve what is essentially a building.

Rick has noticed that the regulations also state that they need to be 50 feet away from intersections when completely enclosed. Rani clarified that the 50 feet restriction is on a case-by-case basis based off pedestrian safety and other safety concerns.

Karen states that a business essentially put a tent over the entire sidewalk. When walking, it doesn't feel like you should walk through it, and people are walking on the street. Rani responded that they likely have been contacted multiple times and may have had their permit not renewed. Karen's concern is that businesses have spent a lot of money on these, but they might be out of compliance. Due to the amount invested, it may be difficult to deny the permit.

Nick Fenster had questions about the survey methodology. Rani stated that they were stickers on the sidewalk placed where health street permits have been issued. Nick Fenster asked about the number of responses. Nick Falbo estimates about 500 responses. Nick Falbo stated that they are in the process of creating a comprehensive report. Rani stated that there is also a report from last year, from the first year of implementation.

Karen said that competing needs of neighboring businesses can be challenging. A restaurant has received more square footage at no cost by participating. However, if there were a clothing store next door, they would not have access to display their clothes. Rani responded that all businesses that have active uses can apply for the permits. Bookstore and a few other business types have applied and been approved; however,

permits are largely issued to food and beverage businesses. Temporary 5-minute spaces were also created, and are being further explored by PBOT. Some conflicts are in street-plazas where unanimous decisions are difficult. When a business wants to use a parking space, they cannot get a permit for a space in front of a parking space in front of another business without permission from the other business.

Don commented that determining the balance with restaurants is difficult. He hears from retailers that having the outdoor seating for restaurants has drawn business into the area. He also said that there are challenges near 13th for example where it is challenging to be able to navigate in the area.

Karen is concerned that if this is a long term program, that the program may needed to be looked at in a different way.

Don commented that there are SAC members would like to make sure that revenue loss is part of the Healthy Business permit process in the future.

Mark asked who is going to do the design standard review since that typically is not PBOT's focus. Nick Falbo responded that a similar program did exist before the pandemic that had higher design standards. Consultants with landscape architect experience will likely going to be used. Rani responded that there likely will be flexibility with individual permits, but a consultant will be seriously considered when developing standards.

Rick said that he liked the standards before COVID that are still posted online in terms of setbacks, height, and openness.

Rick requested from Rae-Leigh to try to determine how much net meter revenue is being lost by the 74 Healthy Business permit spaces, or possibly average amount of revenue per parking space. Rae-Leigh asked if ECONorthwest is part of planning team and might be looking at how the Healthy Businesses program have affected the economic environment, and if net meter revenue should be part of it. Rani responded that ECONorthwest is assisting them with long term fee analysis to determine value of space. They need to also consider the value of the space as an attraction and brings customers to the area.

Jeanne asked how someone can participate in the planning process, and if submitted feedback is reviewed. Rani responded that the feedback has been reviewed; but if something is still occurring to resubmit it along with comments about the program itself. The committee can also submit feedback as a group as well.

Public Comment

None

Outcomes from the SAC Reflection

Kristan led the last of the 3-part SAC reflection. The SAC has shared that they feel like there was a loss of autonomy since there was a Transportation Management Association (TMA) originally discussed. However, the SAC is what was formed as part of the Northwest Parking Plan. Kristan asked for thoughts on aspects of a TMA that committee members feel like they do not have.

Karen stated that it is frustrating that in order to spend money, it needs to follow the City's slow and lengthy process and that there is little to show for the time spent. There was a perception that they would have been able to act on their own to improve Northwest much quicker. Kristan said that this comes back to the money being public funds, which means the process must be followed.

Don said maybe the City needs to streamline the process.

Karen asked if Northwest were a TMA, would they need to go through the City to work on projects since it appears that Lloyd has more freedom to spend funds. Chris said that they can discuss the different structures and what can be accomplished in by the TMA and SAC structures, and asked if they should discuss that now or later. Rick said that they will have to defer the discussion.

Alex would also like information about the differences between a SAC and a TMA. Chris said a separate meeting will be set so that more time can be provided.

Mark is frustrated with the apparent lack of progress on tangible improvements. Other neighborhoods have a sense of identity that Northwest lacks. Mark asks why the committee can't hire a lighting consultant for more ornate lighting, and not cobra heads that feel industrial. Mark asks why movement has not been made on more design sensitive lighting structures being installed, or a sense of neighborhood identification. And, what the committee should have done in to get these types of projects implemented. Rae-Leigh responded that the committee approved the cobra lights, and they are being shipped and will be arriving soon. Regarding design standards, a streetscape plan scope was discussed by the committee in July, but put on hold for 6 months.

Jeanne thought 21st and Glisan can be improved and there was progress being made. When the project was stopped, she was told that PBOT stopped without informing the committee. Rick agreed stating that he thought this project was still moving forward, and that there are other PBOT projects that appear in Northwest without the SAC's knowledge. This is like complaints about Healthy Business permits that feel like they were unheard.

Rick said that “it's an issue of autonomy and things we thought we're going to be able to do. It's an issue of speed, how long it takes. It's an issue of feedback and feeling like a participant instead of having things just happen in the neighborhood.”

Karen agrees since it feels like PBOT imposes projects. Mark stated that projects like Northwest in Motion utilize meter funds and is also interested in why the Glisan offramp intersection happened the way it did.

Kristan asked if the committee is interested in more information sharing about projects in Northwest, potentially Rae-Leigh sending project updates. Karen would like to know when things in the neighborhood are happening since people might think that the committee is spending funds on those other projects.

Don agrees with Karen and is shocked by what Jeanne said about the lighting project since he thought it was still going forward. Don feels like the committee is a sounding board for the City, but they will go forwards regardless of the feedback given.

Ron stated that pre-COVID, the committee determined their own agenda and it felt that they led the process. Ron feels that issues, such as off-street event parking, that the committee find important are ignored.

Alex said that the committee is just one small part of the neighborhood and city. It is difficult to point to something in the neighborhood and state “this is where your parking dollars go”. It's been some time since they last had an open house, but how the committee outreaches to the community needs to be considered. Community outreach would be a good way to hear from others and make sure they are brought into the conversation.

Mark asks how the process can be changed to how the committee felt it used to be with a bit of autonomy. How can the structure be changed so that the committee can spend their portion of the money without it taking an extended period of time.

Chris said she was also unaware that the lighting project at 21st and Glisan was canceled. She thought it still was moving forwards, so she will look further into it.

Chris also asks what's changed in how the agenda was developed a few years ago compared to now. Rick said the present process is that the chair and vice chair develop the agenda with the liaison.

Rae-Leigh said that she is still looking and working on off-street parking at Legacy. If there are any items that the committee would like added to the agenda, to let her know.

Karen suggested that an ongoing list of what is happening is maintained.

Tom said he acknowledges that as an advisory committee, there are limitations in what they can provide and expect. However, it feels like the committee is there as a “rubber stamp” for PBOT.

New Business

None

Meeting Adjourns.

Action Items

Provide the SAC with additional information on the following:

- Income-based permits
- NWIM project update, specifically regarding NW 21st and Glisan
- Information on Parking Enforcement in NW
- 2013 Amended NW Parking District Plan

Meeting Transcript

>> Chair Michaelson: The downside is we are expecting to complete our off-street parking study and present it to the committee in August. It would be nice to have the old timers there, but even if we appoint new people, the old timers can still participate. Thank you for that suggestion, Ron. Do we have enough people yet?

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: It looks like we do.

>> Chair Michaelson: I would like to call this meeting to order. It is our first meeting in 2022 and maybe our last Zoom meeting, if we're lucky. I know we have been saying that quite a bit. I'm hoping to see all of your faces in the same room sometime soon. With that, we will start our regular agenda. Owen, you are up to talk about your study and findings.

Obviously, some people read it and others are not all the way through it yet, so I'm hoping we can accept comments over the next couple of weeks.

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: Can I jump in real fast? I want to do an introduction of Stanley Ong. He is our newest parking operations employee, and he will be spending half of his time in the Northwest Parking district. He is moving from Pullman, Washington, where he worked at Washington State University in their transportation department. Stanley, do you want to give an introduction?

>> Stanley Ong: Hi, my name is Stanley. Great to meet you. My name is Stanley Ong, so before coming to the city, I did work for W.C. Pullman in the transportation department. I started working in enforcement in 2011, moved towards a customer service role. Ran and managed football operations for a year and some projects, I'm especially proud about that I was able to participate in over at CW Pullman include taking our parking permit system to a virtual-based system, as well as realigning our zone assignments and zone designations to match the current demand. Before leaving Pullman, working on minor tweaks as we were doing that on a regular basis.

>> Chair Michaelson: Terrific. Welcome aboard. I'm sure your skills will be very helpful moving forward. Owen?

>> Owen Roncelli: OK, thank you. Let's see, I'm going to just right in. I don't know. I could do a quick recap of the presentation last time, but if folks want, I can just go into, if you recall last time, we went through all of the findings in terms of occupancy, peak hour, average length of stay, that type of thing. This second half of the presentation that's not really a half, it is a third, so you got two-thirds last time. The third this time is permit allocation and how that shook out by assessed on the allocations overall for the entire district, but also how we observed it in the field as well. If you want, I can jump into that piece now.

>> Chair Michaelson: Excellent. Go for it.

>> Owen Roncelli: So, let me share this. Are folks seeing that?

>> Chair Michaelson: Yes.

>> Owen Roncelli: Great. So, what I want to point out for the permit allocation, we had to boil it down. We got a couple of different sources of permit allocation members, and we vetted that thoroughly with city staff, so I think we have good numbers in here now. Comparatively speaking, if you recall last time, we talked about the percentage of

spaces occupies by permit users versus visitors. We noted the increase of visitors' usage over 2020 results and how it markedly gone up. If you look at the distribution of permits out there at the point in time that we surveyed, previously in 2020, there was just about 2,100, just a little bit more. So a small tick up, we have 2,137, only represents a 2% change. These are minor changes overall on the residential side, just a little over 2,400 and now you're at 2,500, 3.3% change. Less than 3% allocation change.

In my opinion, I think this is positive. We want some predictability with the amount of permits being allocated and as you recall, the old timers, as you say, Rick, when we first did this, there were wild changes between one year and the next with the allocations, but now we're seeing less and less as we go forward. One, because of the changes that have been implemented about who can receive them, but also people can learn that they may be don't need an on-street parking permit or we're seeing a shake out of the variability in the distribution, so wanted to point that out.

Of the 2,500 residential permits, 1,100 are income based compared to 42% last time around. And then, these numbers here, I might flip to another slide, and I will reference a table if you guys want. This is interesting to see how many permits are displayed in the peak hours. There were more distributed in 2019 overall, but I think the comparative here is that we saw more permits on street. We saw more vehicles overall, a slight uptick in 2021, but we see more of a downswing in the number of permits. Part of this is there are fewer temporary permits out there, but more than anything, I think the fact that more folks are perhaps leaving. We have seen an uptick in the number of visitor trips, so I think these are, again, positive numbers.

So, if you want, I can flip back and forth before the recommendation. We don't have to spend a lot of time on this, but I want to show you the float, where we were before and where we are now. This is table 8 in the summary report. But with 2,100 business permits versus just shy of 2,100 last time, the float is quite similar. We're handing out a bunch of permits, but only seeing 800 in use at any one time. Which is a remarkably small percentage of the overall distribution.

In residential float, it is almost dead-on, which I thought that was interesting the fact that we're seeing similar amount of float out there with the amount of distribution that is happening. So, that is for all of the geeks out there.

If you look at the overall numbers, since we're at 81% combined by permit stalls at the peak hour, we are not recommending any further reduction in amount of permits allocated. During a peak hour, we could go up to this number to hit the 84%. For those

who don't know, the 84% is the target rate that we're using for a calibration rate. It is correlated to the number of permits that we see in the peak hour that are out on the street. In this case, we don't want to allocate the full 8,492, we want to do less than, that because it accounts for the amount of growth that could happen over time, so what we're recommending is 4,650 permits broken out by the same distribution, with 54% going to residential.

>> Chair Michaelson: Questions at this point? I can't see you. No questions from anybody?

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: Karen's hand is up.

>> Chair Michaelson: Who is this?

>> Karen Karlsson: Me. Karen. I haven't studied your report yet. Sorry, I haven't looked ahead, but it seems to me that it would be important to have the 2019 numbers for permit allocation, for income-based, displayed, et cetera, because 2020 was a pandemic year. 2021 was a pandemic year, and we have a lot of people who are, you know, working at home, who are residents. We have a lot of businesses where many of their employees are working at home. And so, I'm still not so sure that just thinking about 2020 and 2021 really gives us an indication of what it will be in 2022, fingers crossed that we will get more back to normal. Did the 2019 numbers in your report --

>> Owen Roncelli: It is a great question, Karen. Because of your comment last time and this time as well, I've made sure I included references to '19. What I wanted to avoid was to have, you know, kind of the whole thing be a comparison to 2019. I tried to include '19 references sporadically or where I feel it is important or I will include a footnote. Your point is well taken here. That can be done in this instance, too, and I'm making a note of it right now.

>> Karen Karlsson: OK, because my concern for an example, we say we have 44% or 42% in 2020 of the residential permits being income based. I'm curious what it was in 2019 before everybody lost their jobs and became low-income and therefore needed an income-based permit. Because I think 44% is really high. I'm wondering if we're really not getting, I mean, because it is being self-declared, we're getting a lot of people self-declaring that, you know, maybe we are cheating a little bit of the system, so that is the kind of thing I'm more interested in. I would want to propose make a change on the income-base thing if it is that high.

>> Chair Michaelson: I think that is worthy of a discussion, Karen, whether we are doing our best job to deal with our diverse population or if there is a better way than reduction fees. Ron, you had your hand up.

>> Ron Walters: So, what I think is close to obvious is the two pandemic years are completely different than 2019 and prior to that. Demand for on-street parking cratered and I'm wondering, everyone saying cross their fingers. I'm wholeheartedly in the same camp, but if it does spring back, what should, and can we do? In other words, I think we will get through this, right, I did skim through the whole report. My big thing will be, you know, drinking from a fire hose and are we ready if we really do see a hopeful rebound in visitors, employees coming back to the district, the hospital, timbers and thorns games. That would be fantastic. What are we going to -- what can we learn from the past, which may be 2019, to are we ready? Are we ready for a big uptick or are we just getting not complacent, we're hitting our goals not because of direct actions on our part, but because of the market the way it is.

>> Chair Michaelson: Do we want to consider a real cap at this point, because now we have gotten used to having fewer permits? Other questions? Before I dig in with my two comments.

I will go ahead. One of the things I noticed Owen is early in the morning and very late at night there is not a huge percentage of the residential permits being used, so I wonder where they are sleeping. They are not sleeping in the neighborhood, or they have been issued to people who don't deserve them, and we have an enforcement problem there. So, that is something to think about.

>> Owen Roncelli: That is a darn good point, Rick. Granted, we start at 7:00 a.m., so people have left by then, but that is only 1,015 permits that we saw. Keep in mind, that is only a sample, so we're only look at 3,560 stalls out of 5,400 stalls, so, yeah.

>> Chair Michaelson: It could be 1,401 out of the 2,500, it is still a big gap. So, that is something to think about. The other thing is, and this is more of a question for staff. If we're going to have a cap or monitor this thing, we need to know when permits are no longer being used. With this electronic system, do we have any way of knowing people moved out of the neighborhood? Do we need to give people a refund to encourage them to return their permits or cancel them? Something to think about. I don't want to get into a discussion today, because we have a bunch of stuff to cover. Owen, other recommendations?

>> Owen Roncelli: I will go through this, and I have a piece on healthy business permits that I know you have an upcoming discussion on that as well. I will give you my take on it from a parking perspective. Overall recommendation, these are the high points. We're looking at 4,650 for the total permit allocation. I wanted to keep this in here about the enforcement hours. I don't think it is, you know, pressing immediately. I think we're hitting our occupancy targets. we can talk about compliance that is another story, too.

I do think that, when we get back to, you know, even the adjustment to normalcy, I think the later enforcement hours is a better fit for northwest, that is my personal opinion, so I want to keep that present and upfront. Also, we've got very minor stall reformatting recommendations that remain. Those are the overall big takeaways in term of recommendations. Again, nothing Earth shattering here. I threw out there about changing the definition of short and long-term meters and put a check mark by that, so that is good.

>> Chair Michaelson: Questions or comments? Let me add my two cents. I'm surprised we have any of those outline spaces left that we haven't done a good job to make sure they all go away. I think it is still an opportunity for returning spaces to use that used to be truck loading zones, so maybe it is worth this cycle to walk the neighborhood again and see where spaces can be added back again.

>> Owen Roncelli: Yeah, good point. We flagged these locations and flagged it with staff. these are somewhat anomalous, so some will crop up as a construction project where a sign was not put back or a sign was missing and because of that, four or five spaces are no limit that weren't before. They do slip through the crack, but they come and go a little bit, and so we try to stay on top of this and try to report it when we see it.

>> Chair Michaelson: You have given staff a list of where the spaces are?

>> Owen Roncelli: Yes.

>> Chair Michaelson: I think Karen has some to add to the list.

>> Owen Roncelli: OK.

>> Chair Michaelson: Mark, you have your hand up?

>> Mark Stromme: I do. We're talking about looking at perhaps changing the enforcement hours from 9:00-7:00 to 10:00-8:00 as a recommendation. As I spend a lot of time in the neighborhood, I don't see much enforcement going on. Can PBOT clarify what enforcement is going on in the neighborhood currently?

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: The Northwest Parking district gets enforcement for both permits and meters. Typically, I know during event days, the goal is five. I don't know the exact number of enforcements, but I can see three. I can confirm with enforcement, so I know the number of events, so I assume it is less than that during regular days, but I will follow-up on that.

>> Chair Michaelson: That will be great, Rae-Leigh, if you can get. The other piece of information that would be useful is besides the number of people, how many stalls they can look at in a shift. Because that is what matters is how much of that area is getting covered and are they there once a day or twice a day or once a week? Let's see if we can get a report on that.

>> Karen Karlsson: It will be good to add the number of violations, so we get a sense of are we only ticketing 10 people in a day [chuckling] therefore, are we doing a good enough job? So, it would be good to have a little more statistic around that.

>> Chair Michaelson: I know Owen's report has a list of potential violators, which is people who did not have a permit and match that with the enforcement. Other comments? OK, Owen.

>> Owen Roncelli: I know I'm running up against my time.

>> Chair Michaelson: You have another 10 minutes.

>> Owen Roncelli: OK, great. So, healthy business permits, love them or hate them, they are serving a need out there. They are being used in terms of the street seats that are out there. There is, however, an impact on the system, and so, the good news is our occupancies are below 85%, from an operation standpoint that is a good number to see. The stalls appear to be available to users who need them, which is as important, too.

However, the effective stalls for the healthy business permits tend to gravitate towards the short term, high turnover stalls located on commercial corridors. Just the pure functionality of where they should be located, I have stats on the next slide that I will share with you about the number of stalls affected.

It makes sense they are located here, however, you have a number of high turnover stall, so healthy business permits are primarily focused on those particular stalls. So, what we're seeing, and this is antidotal is they are being pushed into the residential portion of the streets. So, if you think about the long blocks that are out there sometimes, instead of those being primarily residential, you're seeing short-term stays, which is not necessarily a bad thing. Now, we're having those accessing businesses or services along some of those major corridors, 21st, 23rd, they are walking deeper into the neighborhoods to find their parking, because the spaces they would have parked in is now a healthy business location.

>> Chair Michaelson: Mark is, your hand up again?

>> Mark Stromme: No, it is not. I'm sorry.

>> Chair Michaelson: Can you go back to that slide? Great picture, great example. That is my building. I have a huge complex between the river palm and are doing a great job of using the street and the barista coffee shop that is a 5-minute or 10-minute has lost parking. What do we do to compensate for the other businesses on the block that have different needs and that is part of what we will be discussing in the next presentation?

>> Owen Roncelli: Just from a number's standpoint, 76 stalls that we are part of the study area that we looked at are affected by the healthy business permit and that is only 2% of stalls overall that we looked at. So, fairly insignificant number. Again, you know, the idea or the location of the healthy business permits are targeting the store front locations, in front of bar, coffee shops, in the high turnover commercial corridors that we're talking about.

Of the sampled stall, of the 365 stalls that we looked at, you only have 256 that are short-term stalls in the first place. 76 -- sorry, 76 affected stalls represent 30% of your short-term parking supply out there, and so, the purpose of the stalls is for high turnover. We want people in and out of those stalls, and so, you know, it begs the question, are you getting as many turns as you would ordinarily or are people parking

deeper into the neighborhood, which is as fine that is why we have the mix of stall types that we do out there.

This is -- I'm postulating this question, there is near term impact because of the limited numbers of short term, high turnover stalls potentially and in time, so, you know, that might be a factor, but going forward that effect could be more pronounced in the long term if healthy business permits can be for an extended period, too. I don't know what the returns are on the meter revenue, but I'm putting it out there to make sure that is also a consideration going forward.

>> Chair Michaelson: Questions? Comments?

One of the things I looked at in your report was the turnover rate. The turnover rate didn't seem to be that different in the two-hour meters and the four-hour meters. I was coming at the opposite direction of maybe we should change them to four-hour meters. Do we have the balance of long-term spaces and short-term spaces, since you said the short-term spaces are getting eaten up by the healthy business permits?

>> Vice Chair Fenster: The 30% that is not available, is that. The 21st and 23rd area?

>> Owen Roncelli: What we don't know is the number of affected stalls that are outside of the sample, so we only know that 76% of what we looked at has a healthy business permit piece, so it could -- outside of the sample, it could be a different percentage.

>> Vice Chair Fenster: But it is correct to say on 21st, like you took that one road, it is 30% of the available short-term spaces on 21st that number would be accurate?

>> Owen Roncelli: Yes.

>> Karen Karlsson: It seems like when you look at the sample area, you pretty much did all of 21st and 23rd avenue and a lot of them are, yes, there are some around the corner. You may have missed a few, but I have a feeling that you probably pretty much covered, in your sample area, most of the healthy business permits, is my guess just looking at the map.

>> Owen Roncelli: Sure, I think you're probably right.

>> Chair Michaelson: Other questions? OK, Owen, thanks a lot. I will ask the committee to read the report and gather your questions together in writing, so we can get a response. Owen has tremendous amount of data; some is in the report and some is in the background and this is a time to get a sense of what our questions are and what change we should be doing. Any last questions for Owen?

OK, thank you, very much.

>> Owen Roncelli: Thanks, everybody.

>> Chair Michaelson: Over to the healthy business program update.

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: We have two people to present tonight. We have Rani Boyle and Nick Falbo. I think you are both set up to present.

>> Rani Boyle: I'm Rani Boyle and I'm trying to show my slides. I work at PBOT, and I manage the group that processes healthy business permit requests and trying to keep them in compliance, and I'm joined by Nick Falbo.

>> Nick Falbo: Hi, everybody. I'm a transportation planner PBOT's planning group. I have been involved in healthy business work since the beginning of the pandemic and now part of the team that is looking at what comes next, the street uses and public spaces that have been created through this program.

>> Rani Boyle: Thanks so much for having us. We appreciate the opportunity to give an update. We're in a pivoting planning stage, so it is a good time to talk to folks. First, a little bit of history. PBOT and Portland have been doing creative street use for a long time and when the pandemic started, we were in a better position than a lot of other cities, because we had relevant permit programs. We had sidewalk dining and street seats around town, so we did have parking space use. We had a robust community event program for block parties and street fairs, so we had a lot to work with for the pandemic to pivot.

However, what you see most often and what you have been talking about so far, the use of parking spaces. We had a different program before the pandemic and it was extensive review, a high design requirement, it was onerous to be part of, and it was a

new program, piloted. We had about 10 street seats around the City of Portland prior to the pandemic where we had restaurants and parking spaces. Oh, and it was very expensive. It was extremely expensive for restaurants to participate, and we incorporated meter revenue in those cost, so that impacted where you saw them around town and why we had so few of them.

Here a few examples around town prior to the pandemic. Very high design, really, flashy, very nice spots. I have eaten at most of these. Pivoting to pandemic time, 2020, it was an emergency situation, so that was our approach to the situation. We were really concerned about folks' ability to access services, businesses, restaurants and do that in a safer way. Outdoor seating, the ability for restaurants to have more socially distant seating, because they were cutting down on indoor capacity. There was an economic aspect, so it has been a strong effort to keep businesses open during the pandemic and continue some continuity, which continues to be difficulty for them.

We used our existing permit structures to make something really quick that might work for the most folks. We have been completely waiving permit fee, so every business using the street spaces, there is no charge for them. We had a high level of customer service helping folks get through the application process, really big equity emphasis, trying to help businesses of all sizes, really low design standard, because we did not want to be any financial or material barriers to restaurants or businesses to participate. So, our focus has been on access, again, the permit has been free, so no consideration for lost parking meter revenue, what part of time it is, what kind of restaurant it is. It is trying to help as many people participate as possible. Before, we had 10 around town, now, we probably have more than 400. It has varied over the pandemic, but a much higher number and a lot more interest for a lot of reasons.

We want to include a snapshot map, so people can get an impression. This is happening all over town. I know particularly on 21st and 23rd there is a ton of installations, but there are quite a few installations around town, so most main streets, most commercial nodes have quite a few, pretty popular. We don't see as many in areas where w a lot of off-street parking that is the one distinction.

So, when we came out with our first permit condition, we're focused on temporary materials, so I don't know if you can even remember the beginning of the pandemic where we thought it might be a couple of months. That's where we were and that is the context we were using so, we wanted folks to go out, set up for a couple of months, this would all be over and we can move on with our lives. Our permit conditions focus on temporary materials and that is what folks are encouraged to use. We will talk more

about how that has played out, but you can see, it has been easy to participate. We have not had onerous requirements.

We have already started to do some outreach at some of these locations. Our planning team has done sticker surveys two years in a row. Two summers they have gone out to areas where we have a concentration of permit, put out stickers, so people can text phone number and get a survey and answer a few questions. First question was about feelings of safety in terms of COVID. We wanted to know; do you feel comfortable. These installations, walking by them, using them and the numbers were pretty good, in both years. So, that encouraged us to keep going.

We also asked about hazards on the sidewalk. Something we are aware of, there are conflicts on sidewalks when we allow or don't allow other uses there. Crowding of sidewalks is a big issue, especially in commercial areas with narrow sidewalks, so we did ask about that. I'm sure it doesn't get to all of the considerations and concern, but something we have been keeping top of mind the entire time.

And finally, we have been asking folks if they think it should continue. So, the first year, should this continue during COVID and with flying colors, there was a lot of support for that and now we're starting to ask, should this continue beyond COVID. Sometimes we joke, it is the most popular thing that PBOT has ever done, because the numbers are pretty wild. It is really nice to see that, but we have a lot to figure out and ask about.

Just a few comments during the survey, we gave people opportunities to provide some feedback and we did get a lot of glowing comments for the program. I do want to mention we have done targeted outreach and there is a large number of businesses in Portland, who at least nominally say this program helped them stay in business throughout COVID, which is heartwarming to hear. We hope that is the case.

We have started thinking about these programs in terms of not just COVID response, but are they part of PBOT's efforts to increase active transportation modes, so we asked how people arrived in these locations. It does not mean they ate at the restaurant, or sat in the seats, but if they are there, we asked them how they arrived. It is phenomenal how many people walked or biked, so it's pointing in the direction that this has encouraged a lot of people to visit their local commercial areas. Obviously, we don't have great before data, but it is heartening that it does not seem like we're driving a lot of automobile traffic.

On to the problems. Everything has been lovely so far, here we are. In our survey, we did get some concerns expressed as well. We have been accepting feedback and installations throughout the entire pandemic, partly because anything in the street in particular has a safety impact, if the traffic control devices are not used, if it is in the travel lane, it can be dangerous, as well as the accessible standards. Our standards are focused on temporary materials, that is not how they have always been interpreted. When something does not seem like an eminent safety concern, we have a light touch as far as compliance. We have not been fining people. We take a strong stand when something is an imminent safety or accessible sure, but when it is a design sure, we have been friendly about it and we get after them, but we have tools at our disposal that we have not used that as time goes on, we will be moving into a stronger compliance and enforcement stance.

I included one here. We have sidewalk blocking issues. Every time we receive a complaint, we reach out to folks. If we know we have an egregious noncompliance issue, we don't renew permits, but we know they are still out there. We also heard concerns about impact on parking, so I know that has coming up in this meeting and that is something we have gotten survey questions about this as well.

>> Chair Michaelson: Is this something likely to be approved under your program?

>> Rani Boyle: No, it is very unlikely. We are just at the beginning of thinking of the long-term design standards but speaking as a person who cares about the sidewalk experience and transparency and being, you know, lighting and what it is like to be a pedestrian, it seems extremely unlikely that we will ever get to the point that we will approve essentially build information the right of way. I don't want to preclude that in an open planning process, but this is something that we are telling people to remove today. It doesn't meet our current standards. I don't foresee that being allowed any time soon.

>> Chair Michaelson: The other one I noticed is your regulations be more than 50 feet if they are enclosed and that has been ignored. I don't know if it is a case-by-case approval or just been ignored.

>> Rani Boyle: The intersection rules are dependent on whether there is a stop sign. So, they are allowed at intersections under certain circumstances, what is the pedestrian visibility, so they are reviewed on a case-by-case basis, but on the whole, we do put effort into making sure we're not blocking stop signs, especially impacting pedestrian safety.

>> Chair Michaelson: It would be good to have more information on your website, as you develop these, the rules should be clearer for people.

>> Rani Boyle: Certainly.

>> Chair Michaelson: Questions that the point? Karen, you have your hand up.

>> Karen Karlsson: There is a certain condition caddy corner from my office that I have complained about before. This is a business who put a tent basically over the entire sidewalk. They have their seating out, like where the tree and I think you call the furnishing zone, but they tented the entire sidewalk, and they have all of their service stuff up against the building and plants and this. When you're walking down the street, it doesn't feel right to walk through their business to get to where you're going, so people walk out into the street around it. Is that supposed to be part of -- I mean, is that something that got lost in my complaint when I made it?

>> Rani Boyle: Most likely, we have probably e-mailed them 10 different times and sent inspectors and guilt tripped them and hassled them and potentially not renewed their permit for the things that are allowed. It is, are we at that point to crackdown on restaurants? It has been a difficult political moment knowing how many restaurants have been suffering, and so when does that balance tip to being willing to impact them or Port Authority, we can send the maintenance group in and take the tent down and bill them for the time if we're ready to do that. It is a politically sensitive moment and keeping leadership apprised of what the considerations are, but certainly that is not an ideal situation and certainly something if we got a complaint about, I can guarantee you we have reached out to them more times than any of us wanted to.

>> Karen Karlsson: My concern overall is so many of these have spent a lot of money and they do have a permanent feel, yet at the same time, they are not necessarily what meeting what I understand the permanent standards should be, because I don't think we want these -- that's an extreme on that thing, but it is our neighborhood. There. Are other people have spent a lot of money on and I'm afraid that the city is going to feel that because so much investment has been made, they should be allowed to continue to have this rather permanent-looking structure, not as bad as that, but still permanent-looking structure. That's where I feel like I don't trust you guys, no offense. I love these businesses having the opportunity, but I don't know that it is a positive thing across the board.

>> Chair Michaelson: Nick?

>> Vice Chair Fenster: I had a couple of questions about the survey data. Can you reiterate again, how was the survey distributed and what was the survey of?

>> Rani Boyle: Can you repeat that last part?

>> Vice Chair Fenster: How was it distributed and who was surveyed?

>> Rani Boyle: These are stickers.

>> Vice Chair Fenster: And that's the same for the mode split data?

>> Rani Boyle: Yes, the same survey.

>> Vice Chair Fenster: Do you have the numbers, I saw the percentage, but do you know how many responses.

>> Nick Falbo: We had 500 responses.

>> Vice Chair Fenster: I would love to see that to put those numbers in context and if you have any other information, demographic, age, region, that kind of thing.

>> Nick Falbo: We will be publishing an evaluation report that includes more comprehensive reporting.

>> Vice Chair Fenster: Because they are dramatically one-sided results, but it might be bias to whoa is seeing and responding to the surveys.

>> Rani Boyle: We're going to have an evaluation report coming out in a month or so, looking back at this recent season, but there is an evaluation report from the 2020 summer and that is on the PBOT safe streets initiative website and is a great read and talks about other programs as well.

>> Chair Michaelson: Other questions?

>> Rani Boyle: Something I do want to mention since we're talking about concerns, compliance and enforcement, I want to draw attention to the fact that these installations are regulated almost by an unlimited number of regulatory partners. PBOT has a focus on the right-of-way space and traffic safety and sidewalk accessibility, but these businesses do better and are regulated by other agencies as well. There is noise, because there is more occupancy outside, that is not just in right of way, it is in parking lots, rooftop bar, any outdoor spaces that businesses can make use of during the pandemic. We distribute information about noise control and the need for permits if there are exceptions, if you are exceeding limits, but it is regulated by civic life, so there is a noise control office that manages those complaints.

Portland fire and rescue, they have restrictions for emergency vehicle access, which we include in our permits as conditions, but they regulate tents and propane and other features, and they have their own rules that they change in their description. PBOT is not always apprised of all of them, so it is something to be aware of those businesses, especially food businesses are subject to a lot of regulatory agencies that we don't always know. Especially when the restrictions on indoor service changed, there were rules how enclosed for a tent to be, indoor, outdoor, those changed overnight. It was not something we could include in our permit conditions, but something that businesses had to react to and influenced how they use our permits. So, it is a complex environment for businesses to adjust to. All right, where are we now? I think there is a question, Karen?

>> Karen Karlsson: I want to make sure we circle back on, as we're looking to the future a couple of things. One, I think Rick pointed out a conflict between two tenants in the same building, because they had different needs and that can hold true not just between a coffee shop and a restaurant, but it can hold between a clothing store and a restaurant. So, what you have for a restaurant, right now, they have been given additional square footage for free. They have been able to seat more people, because there is no longer the rule that people have to be 1,700 feet apart in your restaurant, now they can seat people in the restaurant and outside and that square footage is free. And so, the clothing store doesn't get that. The clothing store doesn't get to use for free the street to display clothing and sell things, so I want to make sure we understand that

as much as it can be really good for our restaurant businesses, and I'm not saying I don't want it to be good for them, but it is not necessarily balanced and fair. I am hoping your future program will think about that and figure out how to work that through. Never mind. That's done. OK.

>> Rani Boyle: I'm going to come at all couple of aspects? How am I doing on time?

>> Chair Michaelson: Another 10 minutes.

>> Rani Boyle: OK, for the record, we have allowed all businesses who have active uses to apply for the permits if they feel it is appropriate. We have had bookstores and other businesses take advantage of the program and use parking spaces. I acknowledge most of our permit holders are restaurants, because that makes sense managing inventory, taking it in and out on a daily basis is not as rational, but it is for businesses. The conflict between businesses that are either, you know, better served by parking or better served by space is something that has been brought to our attention. Another emergency program that we started were temporary five-minute parking spaces, so we had an entire program that is still going on where easy to apply for, signage to create, temporary five-minute spaces and not something PBOT is expanding at a greater scale in a more permanent way.

There have been instances where we have issued a healthy business permit to close traffic lanes, we have installed other five-minute parking spaces, so pickup and drop-off is easier. Other businesses are doing online orders and you can stop briefly and pick something up, so we're trying to balance that a little bit. That is another tool that we have in our toolkit to help in the pandemic, but in the long term, it is something we have to think about figuring different parking options of other use of street space.

The only other thing I want to mention is some of the conflicts are on the street, where we have taken a whole street and, in those cases, we often do not get unanimous agreement among business, because otherwise nothing would happen. You can't have anyone, you know, if you ask every business on the street if the street should be there, you will have someone who disagrees. Unanimous is not a workable theory for anything, but when we issue permits just for parking spaces, we do not let a business take out the parking space in front of another establishment without permission. So, if there is a retail establish and a restaurant establishment, we will issue a permit for the space in front of their building, but we will not issue the parking space in front of the retail establishment unless they give us permission. No one is in control of the street parking in front of them, but it seemed like the least we can do during the pandemic

when so many different businesses are struggling. It is something we have attempted to balance, but it is tough, and we know there are different interests out there.

>> Chair Michaelson: Don, you have a question, comment?

>> Don Singer: Totally appreciate to what Karen is saying. There is the balance of the restaurants having the ability to have that area and the retailers do benefit from the restaurant being open. Tenants feel it when the firesides close and when the firesides open. Without the ability, really, to have the outdoor seating, I don't know how we would have made it through the pandemic. And so, you know, there is a balance. I think you brought up a good point about plazas and I think that is a totally different situation than what we have.

>> Chair Michaelson: Yeah, I think.

>> Karen Karlsson: I think my concern is really for the pandemic, because I agree it was absolutely necessary. I'm seeing if this is going to be a long-term program beyond the pandemic that I think we may need to look at it in a different way and I'm certainly assuming they are.

>> Don Singer: I agree. Over the long term, there has to be the design standards, possibly conversation that would have to be provided in terms of being able to provide the outdoor seating is really great. It is a good opportunity and take advantage of it. When I look at 13th avenue and basically how this has destroyed 13th avenue, in my opinion, they really have to think that. I think taking that as an example for this is they are very different. I ask you what happened down by the Gatsby, and I understand the conflict with the barista and everybody else. It is such narrow pathways that vehicles can get through with no parking. Room and board can hardly get a semi in to do their one or twice a year offloading for displays. They had a hard time navigating on 13th, because it is blocked now. So, it has impacted that area negatively, I think and not as positively.

>> Chair Michaelson: I think the lesson from that, when we're creating plaza, we have to be as creative what is around them as with them. On 13th avenue, we tried some parking for our customers, but the fire bureau did not like it very much and the short term, the five-minute spaces around the corner may become an automatic thing that we need to do in a planning point of view. Are there other people who have not seen that would like to comment?

There are a number of SAC members who want to be actively involved in this process, both in term of revenue and design and you heard from some of them and there are others. I'm hoping your process is really open and really -- if you are establishing advisory committees, that you offer some of our SAC members the opportunity to participate in the process. You want to run through the process now and see where we're going.

>> Rani Boyle: I will talk a little bit about the healthy business process of developing that program and Nick may want to chime in a little bit about the forward moving process. I do want to acknowledge that the health be business permit program was built really quickly and it was of necessity. I think everyone here understands the situation and understands why it was the case. It did feel icky developing a whole new program that we knew could harm the streets without much input and there was not opportunity at the time to do that.

We have gone through a couple of permit cycles and tweaked some standards and tried to listen to some feedback we have gotten about particular installations and the program as a whole. I know I'm excited about the fact that we're starting a planning process to think about some of these things and provide more opportunities for input. I do think it will be a stronger program on the whole.

So, I want to note the permits that are out there they are valid through the end of this fiscal year, so the end of June. And then we will invite people to renew permits for another cycle. It is likely to be a longer cycle. We have had short cycles during the pandemic, because we haven't been sure what we might need to change overtime. It is very likely that the next permit cycle will have a fee associated with it, so it is likely to be a subsidized fee. There is an opportunity for us to ask for federal funding again to help this program operate as the pandemic continues. There's American rescue plan funding, however, as we start charging fees, even modest fees, it might change the number of participants in the program, so there might be some businesses out there who only applied for the permit because it is free. The minute we charge a dollar, they might be less interested, so that is something we need to keep watching, because it might change the balance of some of these impacts if there are businesses who aren't interested in renewing. We might have fewer concerns about other impacts. Nick, do you want to chime in about the other planning work?

>> Nick Falbo: Yeah, this is kind of a bigger story as we're seeing more active uses of our streets, whether that is like the healthy business street seating or the street plazas

that have been popping up around the city. We have had for many years policies and plans on the books to support more active street use. With some of the federal funding that we have gotten, we are allocating funds to work through this planning process, looking at street plaza spaces in particular, to try to resolve the community conflicts that can emerge there to figure out how to create a sustainable program in our city, and that includes looking at design considerations and right now, recognizing that these healthy street seat designs are related to what is going on the plazas. We will be looking to do more extensive planning over the course of the next year, looking at how this program can live on, post COVID.

>> Mark Stromme: I have a question. I'm just curious, looking at design standards that you may come up with, PBOT is obviously designs a lot of transportation and circulation stuff, but generally doesn't get into structures like this. Who do you have on staff who would be, or would you be consulting with architects or people like that to bring in or help with design standards with these sorts of facilities?

>> Nick Falbo: Yeah, earlier in the presentation there were photographs of the street seats program. I think it is important to remind everyone that street seating existed prior to COVID, and it will continue post. That program, I don't know all of the details of the more robust design process, but it had higher requirements for design standards and design process. When it comes to public spaces, we are trying to figure out what any kind of Portland public space should be, for those who have been to other city, you know the idea of street plazas is not new. Most cities have. We are late to the game when it comes to reusing our streets for public space purposes. We are hoping in this design process, we will have consultant with landscaping skills to identify what is the Portland Plaza design that we can use in a more, full-time, permanent public space deployments versus what you're seeing now, which is the pop-up, temporary plazas.

>> Rani Boyle: Just to add on, I think we will have both for a long time. We will probably have a lot of flexibility for the individual permits and when it comes down to design in the sense of safety and structural standards, it is possible that we will, you know, consider a consultant to develop certain standards. Maybe everyone will have to be built the same way, maybe we will have three options, maybe we will have a way to propose a specific structure and review process for that, so those are elements that we have to figure out for the long-term program, but it is a challenge. It is fair that we have a whole structural engineering team that loves bridges, but they don't focus on canopies, so it is new territory for us on this scale and way more structures we have had in the right of way of this type. It is a unique challenge.

>> Chair Michaelson: I really like the existing standards, in terms of height, openness, and all of that. I think it is a good start, with COVID, those pretty much got ignored or waived or the idea they should only be seven feet wide and a clearance for the traffic lane is ignored. The amount of closure versus open space is ignored and glad you're looking at it more seriously, and really making the best of this program. I think it is great. I love it.

>> Rani Boyle: That is great to hear.

>> Chair Michaelson: Rae-Leigh, can you determine how much revenue we're losing in the park's spaces?

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: With the planning process moving forward, I was thinking maybe Echo Northwest was on the planning team and looking at how healthy businesses have affected the economic environment as a whole, and looking at meter revenue, would that be something that is part of it.

>> Chair Michaelson: We should be able to generate that figure for Northwest by figuring out, we have 74 spaces and what is the average meter revenue and how much it's costing our T.D.M. programs.

>> Rani Boyle: Yeah, and Echo Northwest is working with us and what is this worth to the businesses, what is it worth to the district? I think it is worth thinking that the idea of having these businesses to have the space and to be able to stay open maybe encouraging folks to park as well, so it may not be a clear space that is lost, so therefore, you lost money. It may be an attractor over the long run that it is a wash, but it is difficult to know.

>> Chair Michaelson: Any other questions or comments for the presentation?

>> Rani Boyle: I think this is my last slide as well. Keeping in mind the long-term planning process will inform our fee schedule, how we think about parking, any kind of citing, conditions and considerations, what are the standards, so we see a lot of work happening in these areas and as we dial the programs in.

>> Chair Michaelson: OK, thank you very much. Anything more from committee members?

>> Jeanne Harrison: Rick, I guess this is what I wanted to know. How do we participate? I sent stuff in, but I have no idea if anyone reads it.

>> Rani Boyle: I promise, we have some phenomenal staff that monitor those forms and I guarantee people are reading them and reviewing our standards. We have an inspector that we send out to take photos. We have folks review the photos. We send out a lot of e-mail, we make a lot of phone calls, so we have records that have been submitted, so I encourage you of new things or something that should be taken care of, let us know. Submit your comments, if you have some, feel free to do that. We set those aside as well, thanks for your patience on some of these. I know it is frustrating when you complain about something, and it is clearly against the rules, and nothing has happened and that's something we are aware of and something that we are constantly trying to focus on. We're encouraging if there are things that unanimous or common concerns, feel free to submit those as a group and we look forward to having more formal opportunities for folks to provide input on the program development as well.

>> Chair Michaelson: Terrific. When is one on the 23rd place is going to be removed?

>> Rani Boyle: I think I'm out of time, right?

>> Chair Michaelson: That's fair. There is a process to get that fixed

>> Rani Boyle: I know the staff talked to them today.

>> Chair Michaelson: Thank you very much for your presentation and the work you folks are doing on this. I know this is a really -- has lots of pluses with the work we're trying to do and minuses that need mitigation and look forward to continuing to work on it. Any public input at this point on this or any other issues? OK, Kristan, I think you are up in our reflection's conversation, and we're about five minutes behind schedule.

>> Kristan Alldrin: Hi, everyone. I'm on the agenda to continue our open conversation to help address some of the items that have surfaced where PBOT and SAC are on the same page. Kind of a continuation of what was discussed last SAC, which was the

autonomy or the feeling of lost autonomy that the SAC doesn't have. Rick, thank you for sending in the resolution that described the formation of the northwest committee as a management association, that was 2009, which gives us the understanding about the comments that were made and the autonomy and where some of you might be coming from.

In actuality, the SAC was formed, a T.M.A. was not normed and there's an updated ordinance that was passed, which describes the SAC that formed and that was part of the Northwest Parking plan final, July of 2013 amendment. I'm not sure if you have that. I'm happy to have Rae-Leigh distribute that to everyone if you don't have it. Nevertheless, the point is you feel there are parts of a T.M.A. that you might be interested in incorporating in the way the SAC functions, so I wanted to hear more from you or anyone that would like to share any aspects that don't exist in the SAC currently that we might be able to incorporate. We can't change policy, but we might be able to work with some of the changes in the way we frame it, so does anyone have any aspects they can share?

>> Chair Michaelson: Any comments? Someone almost raised their hand. Was that Karen?

>> Kristan Alldrin: It was a half raise by Karen.

>> Karen Karlsson: It is there. I see it in the corner of my screen. One of the things that is frustrating to me, and it has been expressed by others as well, is that in order for us to spend money to do anything at all, it has to go through an incredibly slow and lengthy system called the City of Portland. And so, it's not like you have the ability to spend a certain amount of money and we can hire our own consultants and we can do things to get stuff on the ground and show our neighbors and the public that we're collecting money and doing things.

And it feels like we, you know, we're not able to show much of that. I'm not sure in all of the years that we have been doing this that we have much at all sitting on the ground that we can point out where the money that we've been collecting has going to, because the process is really onerous. I could develop an entire building and go through all of the process and build the damn thing in less time that we can get something accomplished through the city's process because it is so slow. We didn't realize in the beginning that we were going to be in that kind of a very slow, onerous loop of getting things done. And so, I think that is my biggest frustration. I want to be able to do something and we can't. It feels like we can't.

>> Kristan Alldrin: That goes back to the public funds, right, and we have a process that we have to follow to spend public funds, so we have to adhere to the city's process. I share your frustration. I know we do, too. All of us in PBOT know it is a long process.

>> Don Singer: Maybe you streamline the process. It is process heavy whether you're a developer or whatever, I agree with Karen. It is insane how long it takes to get a permit to get a T.I. and that is nothing compared to getting anything done here.

>> Karen Karlsson: I guess I don't understand the different structure, but if we were a T.M.A., in some ways, and we were given a share of the money that was collected and metered revenue, which I kind of thought it was happening in Louwen district, they don't have to hire someone to do the study, do special signage, whatever they want to spend that money on. I guess, maybe I don't understand how it typically work, but isn't there other public money involved that the Lloyd district T.M.A. is spending?

>> Chair Michaelson: So, that can be a good thing for you to come back, Kristan

>> Kristan Alldrin: I think Chris has her hand up.

>> Chris Armes: We can talk about it now or we can talk about it later, like a TMA structure and a MA structure.

>> Chair Michaelson: We have to do that at another time. Alex, I thought you had your hand up.

>> Alexandra Zimmerman: I was going to ask Chris to share information.

>> Mark Stromme: I'm a concrete guy and Karen was referring to it, trying to have results that we can tangibly see in a neighborhood as a result of monies that we decided as a group would be good to spend on certain projects, and then try to get the support of PBOT to buy into that. And let's look at a couple of examples here. You have heard me discuss a couple of my ideas. One is neighborhood lighting plan. If we take that as an example, I think we have been talking about it for two years, maybe better, to the best of my knowledge, what we have moving forward is seven cobra headlights and yet, I continue to drive around this city and see other areas where I see, maybe not as

ornate as our typical old town, Portland, double lighting, whatever, but there are all kind of goods-looking street lighting that helps identify a neighborhood.

I consider northwest Portland to be a wonderful vibrant neighborhood that has no sense of identity through whether it be lighting, signage, to recognize it as a historic neighborhood. You have heard me talk about this for some time. Why have we not been able to implement hiring a lighting consultant to try to discuss what some of the costs would be and whether or not it is feasible to have more ornate, not cobra heads. Cobra heads are industrial lighting that serve a great benefit for safety, but I feel like we're sitting on a pot of money for projects, like more design sensitive, historic lighting structures that we work incrementally through and have a certain amount of money each year that goes to it or an historic neighborhood identification sign. Those are two of my points they just, if you could respond, PBOT, why we haven't gotten any traction on that and what would need to have happen from our standpoint as a committee to have some traction on those two points.

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: I can respond to that. We have approved the cobra headlights, and those are being shipped, so we will have those soon where we can make -- it was approved back in August and we will install them, so I will be giving updates on that timeline. They should be arriving soon, in February, actually.

As far as the design standards, I think in June or July, we had discussed a street scape plan scope, and during that meeting, the SAC voted to put a hold on that for six months. We are right now at the six-point. I plan to bring that back to the SAC. Just know, I'm listening, and it was delayed -- it was on hold for six months, but it is coming back.

>> Chair Michaelson: Who else would like to comment? Jeanne?

>> Jeanne Harrison: Just to pile on a little bit. My pet project, which was 21st and Glisan and we could have all of the decorative lighting and I thought it was going forward, slowly, but it was going forward, and all of a sudden it stopped. When I asked why, it was PBOT decided that is not a good use of parking money without any input from our committee and that to me was like, what happened to any input that we gave about that being a high priority project? All of a sudden, it is off the table completely, to me that is a big example where we were not listened to.

>> Chair Michaelson: It is worse than that, because it is off the table without us knowing it. I am still presuming that project is moving ahead. On the other side, things happen in

the neighborhood from PBOT that we don't know anything about like the strange, I don't know what you call it, Lovejoy even 21st where there are these strips that make it hard to do a turn. Stuff is getting dropped without us knowing anything about it. I think just on the healthy business thing, people have been complaining with no response. It is that kind of dropping things into a bottomless pit that I think the committee feels as well. Mark, did you have your hand up again?

>> Mark Stromme: No, do not.

>> Chair Michaelson: Others? I think it is an issue of autonomy and thing we thought we would be able to do. It is an issue of speed, how long it takes, it is an issue of feedback and feeling like a participant, instead of having thing happen in the neighborhood. I think COVID has something to do with it, but it goes beyond that.

>> Karen Karlsson: No, it was easily five years ago that we started this Glisan intersection thing. I remember Jeanne and I talking about it, because it had been collecting money, I don't know, a couple of two or three years and nothing happened, and it is really frustrating that these things -- it feels like PBOT gets to make their decisions and their processes and we're just on the side. We're kind of a token. It feels like we're kind of a token is where it comes from in my mind.

>> Mark Stromme: There are large sums of money that goes from our committee and the revenues. We had a cursory review of that, and I still would love to have an explanation of the Glisan offramp and the circulation planning around not having any way to get into the neighborhood coming southbound on the Glisan offramp, I would love to hear that, and that is possible. Anyway, yeah.

>> Chair Michaelson: Other comments or questions?

>> Kristan Alldrin: I was going to ask a question about that. It seems like there is a lot, PBOT is a big organization, so the way the format -- the format that we have here for the meetings is not necessarily informational. It is to talk through issue, so -- is that what you're interested in having more information sharing, or would you like Rae-Leigh to send out project updates and northwest have to hear them for an FYI kind of thing? I see some heads nodding.

>> Karen Karlsson: Yes, sending us information and should we want to discuss it we can ask to bring it up and discuss it at the next meeting, but when it would be good to know when these other things going on in the neighborhood happen, because in some ways, some people may think that is what we're doing, spending our money on and if not, we don't know what we're doing. It would be helpful to know more.

>> Chair Michaelson: Don, do you want to make a comment?

>> Don Singer: No, Karen said and I agree with what Karen was saying. I would like to add this. I'm shocked at what Jeanne said and I'm incredibly dismayed by that. If the lighting project at 21st, I thought, still going forward and this is the first I heard of it. It gives me the sense that the SAC is a sounding board for the city, but they will go on and do what they want anyway, because they consider they have more say over the money than us as their constituents, and taxpayers have that have, input in planning something. So, that's the type of behavior that is not conducive to a healthy SAC.

>> Chair Michaelson: Ron?

>> Ron Walters: It struck me, pre-COVID, maybe four years ago, for the most part, we determined our own agenda and made recommendations to our agenda. It felt like we were, to some degree leading the process, and that feels like it has completely flipped. I feel like we don't come in, I have been mentioning the Timbers and off-street parking shared with the Timbers and it never hits the agenda. It is a shame. It never comes up and I don't know why. It seems like there is a common thread here. Issues that we find important, don't come up and they get backgrounded, and it seems like we sort of get a secondary or non-proactive advisory role that is often ignored or not even sought. That feels backwards to me. It is less interesting to participate in this process if we're on our heels, sometimes commenting on things that the city's now pushing on us.

>> Chair Michaelson: I'm going to call on all lex then Mark and then Chris and then Rae-Leigh. Alex?

>> Alexandra Zimmerman: I just wanted to put in a plug for the other side. I know this committee has a lot of knowledge and does a lot of important work. We are one small slice of the neighborhood and the city, and even being at this meeting tonight is a certain level of privilege, so I just want to put that out if there for consideration, but you know, I am hearing a lot and I agree it is very hard to point to something in the neighborhood and say this is what your parking dollars are going forwards. It has been

a long time since we have been able to have an open house, but four years ago, we had great open hours to share what the parking SAC was doing, what was going to be coming up with northwest in motion, what are other projects in the area and I don't know when it would be possible to do that again, but I wonder if we can start to think about and talk about how we can get the word out to the community, if there are going to be events going on this summer like movies in the park, just how can the committee plan for the community outreach? I think that would be a good way to hear from others and make sure more voices are brought into the conversation, as I said, not everyone can access this kind of participation.

>> Chair Michaelson: Thank you. Mark?

>> Mark Stromme: So, I think the real question that is coming up here is, how can we change the process from what it is currently and get it back to what the SAC members believe it used to be where we do have a bit of autonomy. I think autonomy may mean, we talk about study, a lighting study or a street scape study, how can we authorize, change the structure to authorize SAC to have certain pots of money, and spend from our pool of parking revenue and work directly if necessary, with PBOT to try to get consultants onboard and not have it take six months, a year, two years to get anything going? How can we change our structure somewhat to give SAC more leeway to spend some dollars?

>> Chair Michaelson: Thank you. Chris?

>> Chris Armes: I want to circle back to what Jeanne said about Glisan and the curve extensions. This is the first time I'm hearing someone put the Kibosh on that. I remember when that came up and so, I knew it was not moving forward, but I didn't know why. So, from our perspective, we didn't -- we didn't kill that project, so we will dig into where that is. I just wanted to respond to that.

Also, about the agenda developments, and so, I want to check in about how the agendas are developed for the meetings and what you guy see it has changed from how they were developed a few years ago to how they are developed now.

>> Chair Michaelson: Good question. I'm going to need to think about that one. The present process is Nick and I and Rae-Leigh meet together to go over the agenda, over the accomplished and what we need to do, and maybe we need to change that, so there is more involvement or more time on the agenda for people to remind us of what

we have forgotten about. We will work on that. Rae-Leigh, do you want to close up with some comments?

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: Sure, yeah, a couple of things. I wanted to note that there was a comment, Ron had a comment about not discussing off street parking and back in November, we had that conversation about Legacy. I want to let you know; I'm not forgetting that. I'm in motion with that, so that is something we did bring up and we had a pretty big agenda item on that. Again, just like what Chris said about developing agendas, yeah, please e-mail me if there is anything you would like to see on the agenda and I will accommodate, I want this to be a process where you all are involved, so I'm happy to take any input on developing agendas.

>> Karen Karlsson: Maybe we can keep an ongoing list of some of these things are happening and you can check back in with where things are, because I think sometimes it is hard for us to keep up with the status of things. We're not working on it on a daily basis. We're here once a month and more, sometimes. Those of us who are on some committees.

>> Chair Michaelson: Any additional comments?

>> Tom: Rick, it's Tom. I would like to start off by acknowledging as an advisory committee, we obviously have limitations to what we can provide and expect, but I just say from my perspective of watching an old timer for whatever number of years it has been, it seems like we have gone, and I think it is a long way between being on advisory committee to practically a rubber stamp for PBOT's agenda. And that's how I feel about it and that is all I have to say.

>> Chair Michaelson: Thank you. I think this is important conversation. I really want our legacy to be some organization that can carry on when some of us are out and the new members know what is appropriate for their expectations and they can help work as best they can with the present system. I think there are a lot of lessons to be learned here and I want people to pass them on to our successors.

>> Kristan Alldrin: Thanks, everyone for sharing.

>> Chair Michaelson: Any other business tonight? I know we covered a lot. OK, we're adjourned. Thank you.

>> Rae-Leigh Stark: Thanks, everyone.